

Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed October 30, 2007.

I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Prior to the Office Action mailed October 30, 2007, Claims 1, 3-12, 14,22, and 24-33 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 1, 3-10, 12, 14-20, 22, 24-31, and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatenable over Kim et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0120686 A1, hereafter Kim) in view of Tanyi (Easy XML, 2000) and in further view of Park et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0024812 A1, hereafter Park). Claims 11, 21, and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Tanyi in further view of Park and in further view of IBM TDB (Method and System for Visually Constructing Document Type Definitions and Related Artifacts Using a Reusable Object Model, 2001).

II. Summary of Applicants' Amendments

The present Response amends Claims 1, 12, 22, and 33, and cancels Claims 4 and 25, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1, 3, 5-12, 14-22, 24, and 26-33. Reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to prosecute any originally presented or canceled claims in a continuing or future application.

III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

In the Office Action mailed October 30, 2007, Claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Accordingly, Claim 22 has been amended and it is respectfully submitted that Claim 22, as amended, conform to the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In the Office Action mailed October 30, 2007, Claims 1, 3-10, 12, 14-20, 22, 24-31, and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatenable over Kim et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0120686 A1, hereafter Kim) in view of Tanyi (Easy XML, 2000) and in further view of Park et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0024812 A1, hereafter Park).

Claims 11, 21, and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Tanyi in further view of Park and in further view of IBM TDB (Method and System for Visually Constructing Document Type Definitions and Related Artifacts Using a Reusable Object Model, 2001).

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended by the present Response to more clearly define the embodiment therein. As amended, Claim 1 defines:

1. *(Currently Amended) An interactive tool for viewing and manipulating a virtual content repository (VCR) having an application program interface (API), comprising:*

providing a first graphical user interface (GUI) configured to present a hierarchical namespace that spans information in a plurality of content repositories represented by the virtual content repository, wherein the namespace includes at least one element, and wherein one of the at least one element can be selected;

providing a second GUI configured to present and to enable editing of content associated with the selected element in the first GUI;

providing a third GUI configured to present and to enable editing of schema associated with the selected element in the first GUI; and

wherein the VCR logically represents the plurality of content repositories as a single content repository, and wherein each one of the plurality of content repositories represented by the VCR includes a service provider interface (SPI) compatible with the API; and

wherein the SPI enables each one of the plurality of content repositories to be integrated into the VCR.

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the embodiment as comprising providing a first GUI configured to present a hierarchical namespace that spans information in a plurality of content repositories represented by the virtual content repository, wherein the namespace includes at least one element, and wherein one of the at least one element can be selected. The VCR logically represents the plurality of content repositories as a single content repository, and each one of the plurality of content repositories represented by the VCR

includes a SPI compatible with the API. The SPI enables each one of the plurality of content repositories to be integrated into the VCR. Applicants respectfully submit that these features are not disclosed by the cited references.

In the Office Action mailed October 30, 2007, it was submitted that Kim discloses *wherein the VCR logically represents a plurality of content repositories as a single content repository*. The Office Action points to figure 8B of Kim, which the Office Action asserts “teaches a single content repository ‘recipe’ and a plurality of content repositories ‘document’ ‘recipe’ ‘ingredient’ which make up one single repository.” However, Figure 8B of Kim appears to disclose an editing environment including displaying an HTML file alongside its corresponding XML tree and DTD pool (figure 8B, [0102]). Thus, it appears that the elements in figure 8B of Kim cited by the Office Action do not represent content repositories, but rather represent entries in an XML file.

Furthermore, as discussed above, because Kim does not appear to disclose content repositories, it is also respectfully submitted that Kim does not appear to disclose providing a first graphical user interface (GUI) configured to present a hierarchical namespace that spans information in a plurality of content repositories represented by the virtual content repository, wherein the namespace includes at least one element, and wherein one of the at least one element can be selected.

In addition, Claim 1 has been amended to further comprise *wherein the SPI enables each one of the plurality of content repositories to be integrated into the VCR*. It is respectfully submitted that this claim feature also does not appear to be disclosed by the cited references. In the Office Action, it was submitted, while discussing Claim 4, that Park “teaches having an integrate search service for integrating data from various sources and allowing for search based on search conditions.” However, those data sources disclosed in Park do not appear to be content repositories. Instead, Park appears to only a single repository (element 8, figure 1) along with a variety of data sources (elements 15a-e, figure 1). Furthermore, as amended, each one of the plurality of content repositories represented by the VCR includes a service provider interface (SPI) compatible with the API. In contrast, Park appears to only disclose one dynamic search/comparison service to integrate data from a plurality of data sources.

In view of the comments provided above, Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiment defined by Claim 1 is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 12, 22, and 33

Claims 12, 22, and 33 have been similarly amended to more clearly define the embodiments therein. For similar reasons as provided above with respect to Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 12, 22, and 33, as amended, are likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 5-11, 14-21, 24, and 26-32

Claims 3, 5-11, 14-21, 24, and 26-32 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 3, 5-11, 14-21, 24, and 26-32 are similarly neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. It is also respectfully submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

Claims 4 and 25

Claims 4 and 25 have been canceled, rendering moot the rejection of these claims. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to prosecute any originally presented or canceled claims in a continuing or future application.

V. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this reply, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 30, 2008

By: /Guanyao Cheng/
Guanyao Cheng
Reg. No. 58,555

Customer No. 23910
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800